DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 162 SP 005 573

AUTHOR Syropoulos, Mike
TITLE Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations Based on the Evaluation of the Federally Assisted Staff Training (FAST) Project.
INSTITUTION Detroit Public Schools, Mich. Dept. of Research and Development.
PUB DATE Sep 71
NOTE 25p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Behavior Change; *Classroom Environment; *Leadership Training; *Summer Institutes; *Teacher Improvement

ABSTRACT

The primary objective of the Federally Assisted Staff Training (FAST) programs for the 1970-71 academic year was to improve the classroom learning environment in participating Title I schools by expanding the ability of teachers to direct their own improvement by using techniques such as interaction analysis, micro-teaching, and student feedback. Two approaches were used 1) in-service leadership training, with one staff member selected to participate in a 6-week training session which was focused on training school-based in-service leaders; and 2) teacher behavior improvement workshops, where small groups of Title I summer school teachers focused on developing techniques of improving their role in the classroom. In the first approach, 22 people participated and all considered the overall value "good" or "excellent." In the second approach 106 people participated, and 97 percent considered the overall value "good" or "excellent." The evaluation data suggest that the small group workshop approach should be emphasized, time allotments should be reappraised, followup workshops should be provided during the school year, a workshop should be set up to train consultants, summer workshops should be in air-conditioned facilities, the possibility of offering workshops for university credit should be explored, and the teacher behavior improvement workshop should be expanded. (MBM)

ED 061162

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON THE EVALUATION OF THE FEDERALLY ASSISTED STAFF TRAINING (FAST) PROJECT

Funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act

1970-1971

The documents, tables, and other data supporting the findings of this evaluation are on file and available for examination in the office of the evaluator.

---

by

[redacted]
Project Evaluator (Title I)

[redacted]
[redacted]
[redacted]

Jpeas 573

EVALUATION OF THE FEDERALLY ASSISTED STAFF TRAINING (FAST) PROJECT

Background of the Project

More than 14,000[1] teachers and other staff members of the Detroit Public Schools have participated in the in-service education programs made possible through the Federally Assisted Staff Training (FAST) Project since its inception in April of 1966. The participants were teachers in inner-city schools who were provided with such in-service experiences as local school workshops, regional or constellation workshops, individual action studies, and visits to other school systems.

The project was funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and has provided over $1,800,000 during the past five years to supplement the regular in-service training programs of the Detroit Board of Education. The bulk of the expenditures came during the first year, since there were severe cutbacks in funds during the past four years. A breakdown of the number of participants and the expenditures in the FAST Project is shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Number of Participants in FAST Projects
and Amount of Expenditure for the
Projects Each Year

School Year	Number of Participants	Amount of Expenditures	Average Expenditures Per Participant
1966-67	6,226	$1,272,347	$204.00
1967-68	3,692	233,000	63.00
1968-69	3,380	140,143	41.00
1969-70	693	48,855	47.00
1970-71	600[2]	107,000	148.00
1966-71	14,591	$1,801,345	$100.00

[1] Many teachers and administrators participated in more than one workshop.

[2] This number includes 450 participants who participated in six one-day workshops for dissemination of information which are not detailed in the report. All of them were found to be successful in meeting their objectives.

The FAST Project has been administered by the Continuing Education Department of the Detroit Board of Education, along with all other in-service education activities. The FAST programs have been aimed at increasing the effectiveness of teaching inner-city youth of all grade levels. Most programs were instituted during the school year and they were carried out after school hours or on Saturday, but many in-service activities were held during the summer as well.

The Objectives of the Project

The primary objective of the FAST programs for the 1970-71 academic year was to improve the classroom learning environment in the participating Title I schools by focusing on the classroom teacher as the target of its staff development activities.

In working with Title I classroom teachers to raise the learning levels of Title I students, the 1970-71 Project FAST program has been developed with the idea of expanding the ability of teachers to direct their own improvement efforts rather than develop programs prescribed by others. The defining concept of the program was self-renewal; the focus was on the ability of the participants to learn and continually use processes of identification, analysis, and improvement on problems of teaching and learning. Specifically, participants in the FAST program were trained to examine and analyze their teaching behavior and the impact their behavior has on learning by using techniques such as interaction analysis, micro-teaching and student feedback. Also, participants received training in establishing behavioral objectives and the use of teaching strategies that help to develop children's thinking from the lowest level (memory) to the highest level (evaluation). It is anticipated that teachers who develop positive attitudes toward self-analysis and who learn various methods of analyzing their teaching as well as ways to build improvement programs will continue to improve their teaching over a long period of time.

To accomplish these objectives, two approaches were utilized:

1. In-service Leadership Training

   In each of the participating Title I schools, one staff member (e.g. principal, assistant principal, staff coordinator or primary unit teacher) was selected to participate in a six week (six hours per week) training session which was focused on training school-based in-service leaders.

2. Teacher Behavior Improvement Workshops

   Small groups of Title I summer school teachers focused on developing techniques of improving their role in the classroom.

The administrators received intensive training in acquiring those skills that would enable them to utilize some of the latest techniques of observing and analyzing teacher behavior. After the completion of this training program, each of the participants was expected to demonstrate proficiency in the following techniques:

1. Interaction analysis
2. Student feedback
3. Audio and video taping
4. Micro-teaching
5. Behavioral objectives

As a followup to the leadership training workshop, Title I summer school teachers in each of the eligible schools become involved in staff development activities aimed at developing techniques which would enable them to improve their teaching behavior in the classroom.

The in-service leaders trained in the leadership training workshops have had the responsibility of serving as consultants on in-service education program involving Title I summer school teachers in examining and analyzing their behavior in relation to student learning. These workshops focused on helping participating teachers to acquire those skills that would enable them to gain insight into their teaching behavior. Specifically, participants were trained to analyze their teaching behavior by using same techniques mentioned above:

1. Interaction analysis
2. Student feedback
3. Audio and video taping
4. Micro-teaching
5. Behavioral objectives

Ultimately, the aim was for the teachers to develop the willingness and ability to analyze and implement strategies to improve their classroom teaching behavior which would result in improved levels of student achievement.

Procedures Used to Measure Attainment of Objectives

The In-Service Leadership Training Workshop ended in June, 1971, and the Teacher Behavior Improvement Workshop ended August, 1971. Consequently, it would not be possible for many months to obtain data relative to the improvement of administrators, teachers and finally students in accordance with the major objective of the project.

In view of this precluding factor, it was decided that the emphasis of the evaluation of the project would be upon an assessment by the participants of the various aspects of their workshop training program.

Hence, a research instrument was developed for the purpose of obtaining from the participants personal information, feelings toward workshop content and workshop procedures. A pre- and post-check list was used with all the participants.

The instruments were administered to administrators who were present at the conclusion of their workshop training. The same instruments were also administered to teacher participants. The analysis and findings were based on these instruments.

Analysis and Findings

Based on the rationale underlying the evaluation of the program as indicated above and the procedures used to measure the attainment of its objectives, the analysis of the data and findings are presented below.

Analysis of the In-Service Leadership Training

Pre-Workshop/Post-Workshop Check List

In the process of conceptualizing the Leadership Training Program, it was determined that individualizing the experience for each participant was desirable. A pre-workshop check list which could be useful in identifying the level of entry competence for each participant was constructed. The check list, built with a four point scale, included a series of skills and areas of knowledge identified as part of the Leadership Training Program.

The instrument was filled out on the first morning of the workshop as each participant perceived his competencies. During the final session, seventeen participants (three were absent and two did not rescore the check list) were again asked to indicate the then present level of competence on the same check list as used at the beginning of the workshop session. As a result, it was measured the amount of change as perceived by the participant which had taken place during the session. Table 2 is a tabulation of the total pre-test score for each participant, total change for each participant, total post-test score for each participant, and the group mean for the beginning, change, and total score. A t-test of significance was applied to the difference between the mean of the pre-and post-check list results. The difference was significant at .01 level. Table 3 describes the change for each item on the check list as an arithmetic average of the responses and lists the skills in numerical order from most significant change to least significant change. Table 3 reveals that most dramatic change as seen by the participants took place in overt skills (e.g. I.A. coding, building and interpreting an I.A. matrix, use of feedback system, and critique of micro-teaching).

In summary, the data from the pre-workshop/post-workshop check list reveal the following:

1. There was a statistically significant change for the workshop participant.

2. The most dramatic changes, as perceived by the participants, took place in the area of overt skills.

3. The small group sessions were generally more successful in producing change as perceived by the participant than the large group session.

Personal Information

There were twenty-two people who participated in this workshop. They are as follows according to their position:

Table 2

Total Change of Each Participant and the Group Mean for the Beginning, Change and Final Total Score

Pre-test	Post-test	Change
29	38	9
19	31	12
19	34	15
29	39	10
27	38	11
19	39	20
26	37	11
21	37	16
20	28	8
23	41	18
21	46	25
33	51	18
20	37	17
17	38	21
20	39	19
20	38	18
25	35	10
Total 388	646	258
$\bar{X}$ = 22.8	$\bar{X}$ = 38.0	$\bar{X}$ = 15.1

t = 12.7
df = 16
p = $<.01$

Table 3

Arithmetic Average of the Responses and the Skills in Numerical Order of Significance

Check List Number	Skills	Mean Group Change
2	Coding with Flanders I.A. (Interaction Analysis)	2.7[1]
4	Interpreting an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	2.6
3	Building an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	2.5
1	Use of feedback systems for evaluating teaching behavior	1.4
9	Critique of micro-teaching	1.4
8	Conducting micro-teaching	1.2
7	Video-tape equipment	1.0
11	Knowledge of Dwight Allen's technical skills	1.0
5	Gathering student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior	1.0
10	Knowledge of research on teacher effectiveness	0.5
12	Knowledge of role playing technique	0.4
6	Building behavioral objectives	0.2
13	Goal setting in its relationship to teaching	0.05

[1]Mean group change is based on a four point scale.

1. Teacher (2)
2. Staff Coordinator (1)
3. Assistant Principal (7)
4. Principal (12)

The average number of years at their position was six and it ranged from one to twenty. The average number of teachers in their school was thirty and it ranged from twelve to forty-four.

Workshop Content

The instrument was administered to nineteen participants at the conclusion of their training session.

The evaluation of the overall value of the workshop was accorded "good" or "excellent" by nineteen (100%) of the participants. Fifty-eight percent of the participants stated that they tried and/or implemented ideas in their school which were gained in the workshop. The rest of the participants indicated that there wasn't enough time at the end of the school year.

The participants were asked, "What was the main value of the workshop?" Eighty percent of the respondents used the two words in their responses, "teacher behavior." The following infinitives were used with it, "to change, to improve, to observe, to analyze, to evaluate." The following comments is a summary:

> "It opened many avenues for helping teachers.... Broadened my insight relative to improvement.... Helped me clarify my understanding of the teaching process....Introduced me to a systematized method of assisting teachers....Formulizing techniques of observing and analyzing teacher behavior....The awareness of the need to change....Finding methods of self-analysis and renewal...."

The main value of the workshops based on their comments was "teacher behavior."

The participants were asked to state what additional offerings could have been added to the workshop to increase its value to them. Fifty percent of the participants indicated that more time was needed to develop proficiency in the various skills. Some of the administrators had indicated the following suggestions:

1. Research on effectiveness of proposed methods of teacher improvement
2. Five consecutive full days would have been more effective and valuable than extended Saturdays
3. More practical experience in the behavior modification techniques
4. Behavioral objectives and micro-teaching could be handled in much greater depth

Workshop Procedures

For purposes of data analysis, the rating categories were dichotomized so that "not at all" and "very little" representing negative ratings, whereas ratings of "some" and "much" depicted positive ratings.

The participants gave positive ratings (94%) to the following two facets of the procedures:

> "Had clearly defined objectives."
> "Provided adequate time to achieve its objectives."

The following facets of the procedures were given positive ratings by nineteen (100%) of the participants:

> "Allowed adequate opportunity for participation by its members."
> "Selected appropriate participants who could benefit from and implement workshop ideas."
> "Provided effective leadership."
> "Selected appropriate and effective consultants."

Finally, the participants were asked to indicate the strengths and weaknesses, and to give suggestions for improving the workshop procedures. The following are some of their comments:

Strengths

> "Well defined objectives, sufficient materials, excellent leadership"
> "Most tightly organized workshop I have participated in the Detroit Public Schools"
> "Capability and competency of the workshop consultants"
> "Freedom for interaction of ideas"

Weaknesses

There was only one main weakness stated by eleven (58%) of the participants:

> "Not enough time to implement all activities"

Some of the other participants stated the following:

> "Size of the group made it difficult to give everyone as much experience with matrix interpretation and micro-teaching"
> "Not enough practical experience, more depth, less skimming"

Suggestions for Improvement

Twelve (63%) of the participants had no suggestions for improving workshop procedures. One suggested "more time for practice." Another participant suggested to reduce the size of the group.

Summary

The data from the questionnaire which was given to the administrators reveal the following:

1. Average number of years at their position was six.
2. Average number of teachers in their school was thirty.
3. The overall value of the workshop was rated "good" or "excellent" by nineteen (100%) of the participants.
4. Fifty-eight percent tried and/or implemented ideas gained in the workshop.
5. Eighty percent of the participants considered "teacher behavior" as the main value of the workshop.
6. Fifty percent of the participants indicated that more time was needed for the workshop.
7. The participants gave positive ratings (98%) to the workshop procedures.
8. The main strengths were well defined objectives and excellent leadership.
9. "Not enough time" was stated as the main weakness by eleven (58%) of the participants.

Analysis of the Teacher Behavior Improvement Workshop

Pre-Workshop/Post-Workshop Check List

A pre-workshop check list which could be useful in identifying the level of entry competence for each participant was constructed. The check list, built with a seven point scale, included a series of skills and areas of knowledge identified as part of the Teacher Behavior Improvement Program.

The instrument was filled out on the first meeting of the workshop as each participant perceived his competencies. During the final session, all the participants, who were present and had filled out the check list at the first session, were again asked to indicate the then present level of competence on the same check list. As a result, it was measured the amount of change as perceived by the participant which had taken place during the session. There were four workshops held during the summer. In Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7 is a tabulation of the total pre-test score for each participant, total change for each participant, total post-test score for each participant, and the group mean for the beginning, change, and total score. A t-test of the difference in the group mean shows that all four workshops are statistically significant beyond the .01 level. Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 describe the change for each item on the check list as an arithmetic average of the responses and list

the skills in numerical order from most significant change to least significant change. Tables 8, 9, 10, and 11 reveal that the most dramatic change, as seen by the participants, took place in overt skills (e.g. coding, building, interpreting an I.A. matrix, conducting and critique micro-teaching).

In summary, the data from the pre-workshop/post-workshop check list reveal the following:

1. There was a statistically significant change for the workshop participant.

Workshop #1

Table 4

Total Change of Each Participant and the Group Mean for the Beginning, Change and Final Total Score

	Pre-test	Post-test	Change
	15	67	52
	10	65	55
	15	55	40
	20	56	36
	23	59	36
	23	68	45
	10	57	47
	13	53	40
	25	45	20
	31	53	22
	10	66	56
	10	58	48
	16	68	50
	10	67	57
	28	43	15
	16	52	36
	14	63	49
	35	64	29
	10	62	52
	14	55	41
	19	62	43
Total	367	1238	869
	$\bar{X}$ = 17.4	$\bar{X}$ = 58.9	$\bar{X}$ = 41.3

t = 16.0
df = 20
p = $<$.01

Table 5

Total Change of Each Participant and the Group Mean for the Beginning, Change and Final Total Score

Pre-test	Post-test	Change
15	56	41
19	61	42
16	50	34
14	49	35
24	55	31
34	56	22
18	59	41
20	46	26
12	68	56
20	50	30
17	40	23
15	50	35
11	41	30
24	46	22
13	59	46
18	52	34
26	55	29
44	65	21
12	43	31
14	50	36
25	76	41
13	44	31
13	57	44
18	43	25
Total 455	1271	806
$\bar{X}$ = 18.9	$\bar{X}$ = 52.9	$\bar{X}$ = 33.6

t = 18.9
df = 23
p = $<$.01

Table 6

Total Change of Each Participant and the Group Mean for the Beginning, Change and Final Total Score

Pre-test	Post-test	Change
37	69	32
16	70	54
24	52	28
14	38	24
12	42	30
13	42	29
11	39	28
12	32	20
10	55	45
16	53	37
10	41	31
16	58	42
20	68	48
33	64	31
35	55	20
15	49	34
19	37	18
23	53	30
13	68	55
23	66	43
21	61	40
14	52	38
18	69	51
Total 425	1233	808
$\bar{X}$ = 18.4	$\bar{X}$ = 53.6	$\bar{X}$ = 35.1

$t = 15.8$
$df = 22$
$p = < .01$

Table 7

Total Change of Each Participant and the Group Mean for the Beginning, Change and Final Total Score

Pre-test	Post-test	Change
12	59	47
18	51	33
21	64	43
17	57	40
13	57	44
15	60	45
19	70	51
10	58	48
13	48	35
15	57	42
15	50	35
11	42	31
17	60	43
10	45	35
30	58	28
10	63	53
10	57	47
Total 256	956	700
$\bar{X}$ = 15.1	$\bar{X}$ = 56.2	$\bar{X}$ = 41.2

$t = 23.4$
$df = 16$
$p < .01$

Table 8

Arithmetic Average of the Responses and the Skills in Numerical Order of Significance

Check List Number	Skills	Mean Group Change
4	Interpreting an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	5.6[1]
3	Building an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	5.1
2	Coding with Flanders I.A. (Interaction Analysis)	5.1
8	Conducting micro-teaching	4.2
7	Video-tape equipment	4.2
9	Critique of micro-teaching	4.0
1	Use of feedback systems for evaluating teaching behavior	4.0
5	Gathering student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior	3.8
10	Knowledge of research on teacher effectiveness	3.4
6	Building behavioral objectives	2.9

[1]Mean group change is based on a seven point scale.

Table 9

Arithmetic Average of the Responses and the Skills in Numerical Order of Significance

Check List Number	Skills	Mean Group Average
3	Building an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	4.4
4	Interpreting an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	4.2
2	Coding with Flanders I.A. (Interaction Analysis)	4.1
1	Use of feedback systems for evaluating teaching behavior	4.0
9	Critique of micro-teaching	3.9
8	Conducting micro-teaching	3.4
7	Video-tape equipment	3.1
10	Knowledge of research on teacher effectiveness	3.0
5	Gathering student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior	2.8
6	Building behavioral objectives	1.3

Table 10

Arithmetic Average of the Responses and the Skills in Numerical Order of Significance

Check List Number	Skills	Mean Group Average
2	Coding with Flanders I.A. (Interaction Analysis)	4.7
3	Building an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	4.4
4	Interpreting an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	4.3
9	Critique of micro-teaching	4.3
5	Gathering student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior	3.9
1	Use of feedback systems for evaluating teaching behavior	3.8
7	Video-tape equipment	3.4
10	Knowledge of research on teacher effectiveness	3.1
8	Conducting micro-teaching	3.0
6	Building behavioral objectives	2.6

Table 11

Arithmetic Average of the Responses and the Skills in Numerical Order of Significance

Check List Number	Skills	Mean Group Change
2	Coding with Flanders I.A. (Interaction Analysis)	5.1
3	Building an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	4.8
4	Interpreting an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis)	4.7
8	Conducting micro-teaching	4.3
1	Use of feedback systems for evaluating teaching behavior	4.1
10	Knowledge of research on teacher effectiveness	3.8
7	Video-tape equipment	3.7
5	Gathering student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior	3.7
9	Critique of micro-teaching	3.5
6	Building behavioral objectives	3.5

2. The most dramatic changes, as perceived by the participants, took place in the area of overt skills.

3. The small group sessions were generally more successful in producing change, as perceived by the participants, and by the observations of the consultants than the large group session.

Personal Information

There were 101 of the 106[1] participants who completed the instrument at the last session of the workshop. The average number of teaching experience was 8.4 and it ranged from one to thirty. The average number of teachers in their school was 29.9 and it ranged from twenty to fifty-eight.

Workshop Content

The evaluation of the overall value of the workshop was accorded "good" or "excellent" by ninety-eight (97%) of the participants. Ninety-one (90%) of the participants stated that they have tried new ideas in their school which were suggested in the workshop. The following is a summary of the ideas and/or skills used by the teachers:

Coding, building and interpreting matrix (Interaction Analysis) (35)

Conducting and critique of micro-teaching (41)

Gathering and using student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior (53)

Video-taping lesson (5)

Behavioral objectives (11)

Seventy-nine percent of the participants stated that they implemented some ideas gained in the workshop. The following is a summary:

Conducting and critique of micro-teaching (12)

Building behavioral objectives (18)

Gathering and using student feedback for evaluating teaching behavior (18)

Coding, building and interpreting I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis) (34)

Improve my skills (10)

---

[1]In addition to 106 teachers, there were twenty-two administrators, but they were evaluated in the spring workshop.

The participants were asked what aspects of the program did they plan to utilize in the ensuing school year with little or no difficulty. The following is a summary of all the participants who responded (100%):

Coding, building and interpreting an I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis) (40)

Video-taping (11)

Behavioral objectives (23)

Student feedback and analysis (33)

Micro-teaching (10)

Less teacher talk (12)

To the next question, the participants were asked to state what problems did they anticipate in using what they have learned. Seventy percent of the participants responded as follows:

Lack of equipment and materials (27)

Large class size (10)

Communication with the rest of the staff (6)

Need help for coding (15)

Need help to interpret matrix (17)

Evaluate behavioral objectives (12)

Student feedback (7)

Micro-teaching (13)

Lack of time (10)

The participants were asked to indicate what aspects of the program did they feel were of most value. The comments of all the participants (100%) are as follows:

Evaluation of my behavior (10)

Behavioral objectives (21)

Student feedback and evaluation (20)

Micro-teaching (22)

Coding, building and interpreting I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis) (47)

Video-taping (9)

Self-renewal (25)

The participants were asked to state the aspects of the program that they felt were of questionable value or of no value. The following is a summary of their comments (50%):

Force field analysis (6)

Coding accuracy check (18)

Behavioral objectives (6)

Setting up video-tape equipment (6)

Micro-teaching (5)

The participants were asked to state, if they were planning the next training program, what activities would they spend more time or less time on. The following is the summary of their responses indicating that they needed more time (100%):

Micro-teaching (18)

Student feedback and evaluation (7)

Behavioral objectives (14)

Video-tape (5)

Coding, building and interpreting I.A. matrix (Interaction Analysis) (30)

Role playing (3)

Small groups (3)

The following summary indicates that less time should be spent on the following skills:

Accuracy check on coding (10)

Behavioral objectives (3)

Coding (5)

Student feedback (4)

Micro-teaching (3)

Role playing (3)

Matrix and interpretation (2)

Group discussion (3)

Force field analysis (3)

The participants were asked to state when the consultants were most effective and least effective. The following summary indicates when the consultants were most effective (90%):

Worked in small groups (30)

Introduced new ideas and skills (36)

Introduced micro-teaching (6)

Worked with the whole group (6)

The following summary indicates when the consultants were least effective (50%):

Small groups (3)

Large groups (5)

Math computation (3)

Lectures (10)

Force field analysis (3)

The participants were asked to indicate their opinions about the length and schedule of the workshop. One hundred percent of the participants responded as follows:

Good 40% Fair 25% Poor 35%

Workshop Procedures

For purposes of data analysis, the rating categories were dichotomized so that "not at all" and "very little" representing negative ratings, whereas ratings of "some" and "much" depicted positive ratings. The participants gave positive ratings to all the facets of the procedures as indicated after each facet:

a. Had clearly defined objectives. (100%)

b. Provided adequate time to achieve its objectives. (80%)

c. Allowed adequate opportunity for participation by its members. (87%)

d. Selected appropriate participants who could benefit from and implement workshop ideas. (96%)

e. Provided effective leadership. (98%)

f. Selected appropriate and effective consultants. (96%)

Finally, the participants were asked to indicate the strengths and weaknesses, and to give suggestions for improving the workshop procedures. The following is a summary of the participants' responses (83%):

Strengths

Very comfortable atmosphere (7)

New experiences and new techniques (15)

Teacher awareness of his role (20)

Coverage of behavioral objectives, coding, micro-teaching, student feedback (15)

Well organized consultants (31)

Goals and objectives well defined (12)

Weaknesses

Time allowed was too short (30)

Too much homework (10)

Time schedule and setting (10)

More in-depth study in some areas (8)

No air-conditioning (first two workshops) (10)

Suggestions for Improvement

Provide more time for the workshop (17)

Air-conditioning facility (during the summer) (5)

Fewer participants or more consultants (6)

More small group work (7)

Conduct workshops during regular school year (7)

Summary

The data from the teachers' questionnaire reveal the following:

1. Average number of years at their position was 8.4.
2. Average number of teachers in their school was 29.9.
3. The overall value of the workshop was rated "good" or "excellent" by ninety-eight (97%) of the participants.

4. Ninety percent of the participants tried new ideas which were suggested by the workshop.

5. Seventy-nine percent of the participants implemented ideas gained in the workshop.

6. One hundred percent of the participants indicated that they would use practically all the aspects of the workshop. Coding, building and interpreting I.A. matrix, and student feedback and evaluation were the most commonly mentioned by the participants.

7. Lack of equipment and materials, coding, and consultants were the main problems indicated by sixty percent of the participants.

8. Seventy-eight percent indicated that Interaction Analysis, self-renewal, and micro-teaching were of most value.

9. Micro-teaching, behavioral objectives and Interaction Analysis were the three areas that sixty-seven percent of the participants would have liked to spend more time on.

10. The leaders of the workshop were found most effective when they worked in small groups (30%), and least effective in lectures (10%).

11. The length and schedule of the workshop were found as "good" as they were indicated by forty-seven percent of the participants.

12. The participants gave positive ratings (93%) to the workshop procedures.

13. The main strengths of the workshop were well organized consultants and the development of teacher awareness of his role.

14. "Not enough time" was stated as the main weakness by fifty percent of the respondents.

Recommendations

The evaluation data in this report suggest the following recommendations for the FAST Program:

1. Efforts should be made to emphasize the smaller group workshop approach for future in-service teacher training experiences since participants indicate that more involvement and interactions are possible in this type of workshop.

2. Time allotments for workshop should be reappraised to consider whether objectives can be reasonably met in the given period of time. The administrators and the teachers indicate that there was "not enough time."

3. Followup workshops should be provided during the school year for those teachers who need some additional training on some of the skills covered in the workshop.

4. There is a great need to set up a workshop to train consultants. It is recommended that a teacher, selected by the staff and administrators, and one of the administrators should be trained as consultants. These consultants would be responsible to help and train their teachers in their schools.

5. Future workshops held during the summer should be located in air-conditioned schools, or other air-conditioned facilities.

6. Efforts should be made to explore the possibility to offer future workshops for university credit with the board paying their tuition. It was indicated by some teachers that they preferred the credit to the stipend.

7. Efforts should be made to expand the "Teacher Behavior Improvement Workshop" in order to train more teachers. It is indicated by the participants that this workshop was the most worthwhile workshop they have taken with the board.

8. A survey should be made of the eligible schools to indicate what is the best time for the participants to participate in workshop.

9. A survey should be made to find out the availability of video-tape recorders in the participating schools. On the basis of the video-tape recorders a consultant(s) could be hired to cover a number of schools to video-tape teachers' lessons.

Conclusion

On the basis of the procedures used to evaluate the effectiveness of the workshop in terms of the assessment by the participants of the various aspects of their workshop training, the findings showed that the workshops were quite successful. The evaluator strongly recommends that the program should be continued and attempts should be made to expand it to train more teachers.